

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,291,324, issued to Lescot, et al. ("Lescot"). However, the Examiner stated that the double patenting rejection can be overcome by timely filing a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c). Applicants are concurrently filing a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejection and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all the claims, namely claims 2-20, are in condition for allowance. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 10/6/04



Gregory Suh  
Reg. No. 48,187

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP  
PO Box 51860  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0728  
Phone: (650) 752-0990 ext. 104  
Fax: (650) 752-0995